



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/506,781	02/18/00	EADES	A 1473-991365

THOMAS J CLINTON
700 KOPPERS BUILDING
436 SEVENTH AVENUE
PITTSBURGH PA 15219-1818

IM22/1220

EXAMINER

HRUSKOCI, P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1724

DATE MAILED:

12/20/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/506,781

Applicant(s)
Eades et al.

Examiner
Peter A. Hruskoci

Group Art Unit
1724



☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) 1-11 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 12-17 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☒ Claims 1-17 are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 1724

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-11, drawn to a process, classified in class 210, subclass 705.
 - II. Claims 12-17, drawn to a system, classified in class 210, subclass 205.
2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the system as claimed can be used in a materially different process such as the recovery of metals from ores.
3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
4. During a telephone conversation with John W. McIlvaine on 12-15-00 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group II, claims 12-17. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 1-11 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Art Unit: 1724

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(I).

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kuepper. It is submitted that Kuepper disclose (see col. 2 line 44 through col. 4 line 55, Fig. 1, and Fig. 3) the structure of the system recited in the instant claims. With regard to claim 15, it is submitted that the vertical plates 75 in Fig. 3 appear to form tubes in the flotation chamber.

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1724

9. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuepper as above, and further in view of Yeh. The claim differs from Kuepper as applied above by reciting that the flotation chamber contains immersed membranes. Yeh disclose (see col. 3 line 56 through col. 4 line 64) that it is known in the art of water treatment to include immersed screens or membranes in a flotation chamber to minimize turbulence. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the system of Kuepper by including the recited immersed membranes in the flotation chamber in view of the teachings of Yeh, to minimize turbulence in the chamber.

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter A. Hruskoci whose telephone number is (703) 308-3839. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 6:30 AM to 4:00 PM.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. David Simmons, can be reached on (703) 308-1972. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-7718.

Application/Control Number: 09/506,781

Page 5

Art Unit: 1724

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0651.


Peter A. Hruskoci
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1724

P. Hruskoci
December 16, 2000